tual, against the intention of the derred in enacting the temporary law. gh fuch was the motive, as the obr making the act temporary, yet, ired, the authority, which existed on of the temporary law, of course e question is, whether there was an to fettle the rates of the fees due to h I have already confidered. The ne temporary act might justly, be adregulation, and very properly, beoderate of any, that had ever been he whole regulation could not be e it gave the remedy of execution to. my time before, or after the expirarary act, the tables of fees, without e been corrected, or altered, by the not by the delegates alone, but the opeopporary act did not, in any degree, limited duration. Whilst in being, other authority; when it ceased, all pre-existent authority ceased.

he judges have authority to fettle the en fees are due, but their rates not no eccasion for the parliament to afvariety of inflances. If the judges well as the parliament, there would diffinct p wers capable of the fame to equal," they may clash. If the leth ald difagree, and in confequence ent, there thoused not be a regulation the interpolition of parliament may tory, thoused the want of a legislative nied by the authority of the judges. ament may have reculiar motives for arious inflances-when laws are enthe fervices of officers, the merit of very properly confidered, and the re-Pecunar penatties, which judges he general principles of law, may be t on many occasions. Judges may practice in their courts; but the has been regul ted by parliament in , alid without doubt, may be in all. pariament, and the judges having a er, which might clash in the exercise imfical to require a ferious answer. its or three pranches, and they must ablith laws, and how the judges, by ant of a legiflative regulation when an tender the interposition of parliais beyond my conception. The inhament, declaring the legislative will, fuch a declaration conflituting law, interpolition of parliament. The ges will prevail against the declaration, e bra ch of the legislature, because ontroulable only by a law, and fuch of he is not a law, nor has it any deronal efficacy either in prohibiting the in leg a authority, or in conferring

in uld the leading members of one gala-ure be deeply interacted in the re-; that branch-would probably endean exorbicant provision, which another iff nt to. The two branches disagree, ade. A necessity for the judges to act and they may, "perhaps," establish perpetually, which one branch conflive-junges who hold their feats dur-

te an authority, not before legal.

ight in my turn, suppose leading memnt dispositions requiring what they exofed, with the view of having a fubject ho would be of very little importance quality, and order, whose ambition it the whirlwind, and direct the fform." elieve, was, that both branches agreed regulation had been established by an t of that agreement, the fees fettled by on law wou d have been reduced on an ird-I mean by the alternative extenditers to pay in money, or tobacco, and on of fees, according to the old tables, alternative, would have given general one branch held this to be a sufficient ees, the other contended for a greater, the judges, not having been restrained authority of the legislature, remained It will not, I truft, be directly affirmed, fition of the one branch, differted to by the force of a law, though fome confen from the refolves of one branch oppoiments of the other, feem to imply an they have fome degree of obligatory h they can't have, if they are not laws ; medium between an obligatory, declarae of one branch, constituting any rule hen the subject is such, that the concure branches of the legislature is necessary compleat act, and a full compulfory law. not having been restrained by the prothe regulation approyed of by the one, d by the other. The action, and re-actual, no force remained. Their regulation the legislature: for it may be be about 15 it may be about 16 it true. v. (It is true, that the judges hold their leafure, but whillt they thus hold them, legal powers annexed to their flations, ation is fuch, that they rather confer a than receive any from, government: It is preyent their refignation, fo little lof removal. We must consider legal on the principles of the constitution as may be very much improved, I have no ering the condition of our judges, by independent, and allotting them a libeof a scanty allowance hardly suffi-

cient to defray their daily expences. Such an alteration, I am persuaded, would be productive of a very great diminution of the fees both of officers, and lawyers, by promoting the dispatch of juridical business,

and, of course; by discouraging litigiousness.
Objection: Though the legality of the late regulation of fees be determinable in the ordinary judicatories, and course of proceeding, yet that does not prove any difference between this regulation, and the levy of thip-money: for the legality of thip-money was de-

termined in the same course.

Answer. This, at belt, is a weak cavil founded on Fisingenuous misrepresentation. When the regulation ef fees was pronounced to be an imposition of tax, as arbitrary, and tyrannical, as the ship-money, I stated each measure, to prove their dissimilarity. I shewed that the proclamation issued with the projessed design of prevent ng excessive exactions—that it restrained the officers-that there was no enforcement provided or attempted against the people—that the officer was to teek his remedy, where every other creditor is entitled to relief-that the effect of the regulation, as to the people's payment, " depended upon its legality determin-" able in the ordinary judicatories," there being no degree of enforcement, except what should be derived from the law in its regular, ordinary course. - That King Charles having determined to govern without a parliament had, against the fundamental principles of a free constitution, recourse to the prerogative for raising money on the subject, and in pursuance of this scheme of thranny, the ship-money was raised on the whole kingdom, that writs, directing the collection of the tax, required the theriffs to execute the effects of the people, and to commit to prison all who should oppose it, there to remain till the King shou d give order for their delivery; but these expressions, occuring in the sta e, " its ic-" gality is determinable in the ordinary judicatories," are selected by the objectors, as if the ploof of the transactions of the ship gioney tax, and of the regulation of sees, having different principles, and effects, refled merely on this circumstance; and moreover, the egregious misrepresentation of my argument turns out to be of no use in the application, through their extreme ignorance of the subject : for the question, respecting the legality of the thip-money tax was not determined in an ordinary judicatory, and course of

proceeding. Objection. There has been no fuch necessity on account of the cofts, as will just fy the regulation of fees : for if fees are taxes, and taxes can be laid by the legislature only, the necessity of settling the races ought to have been urgent, and invincible, which was not the case; but if the necessity as a invincible, they, who advised the regulation, ought to have feen, that it was not occasioned by their fault; for if so, the neceffity is their accusation, and not their excuse. The blame of the supposed necessity is imputable to those, who apprehended a diminution of income by a legal regulation-of-fees, and have expoled their country to all the difficulties, and dittress "which the wanton 44 exercise of arbitrary power was sure to introduce. This objection is principally drawn from some publications, on the affair of the empargo in the 6th or

7th year of the present King.
Answer. The occasion, and nature of the necessity to ascertain the sees, the officers were entitled to, for the purpose of enabling the judges to award costs, administer justice, and execute the laws, have been fully explained, and the question, whether these sees are taxes, has been already discussed in this paper—the fixing of the rates of fees always due, I contend, is not a tax, and if not, the objection made on the hypothesis that it is, of course fails. The reasoning applied, in the publications on the affair of the embargo, to that sudden, and peculiar necessity, which, if not immediately provided against, would endanger the publick safety, it would be easy to prove, it not entirely impertinent, is quite foreign to our queltion. The necessity, I mentioned, is that ordinary obligation on those, who act in a judicial capacity, to discharge their duty. The necessity of awarding colles flows from the obligation the judges are under to give them by the statute law. The necessity of settling the rates flows from the obligation they are under by the fame law to award certain costs. Whose fault it was, that a legislative regulation did not take place, in consequence of the disagreement between the two houses, if a question that disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, if a question the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the two houses, it is a question that the disagreement between the disagreeme not determinable in any jurisdiction, or by any legalauthority, neither branch being amenable to any superior court. Uncommonly indistinct must the ideas of the objectors be, who confound the authority of a branch of the legislature to propose, or reject, with the

On the question, which of the two branches was functions of ministers? blameable, very opposite suppositions may be made, imputations cast, and with equal decency, and propriety. On the one side it has been supposed, that a varice prevented the regulation of fees, because it would have been productive of a diminution of income would have been productive or a diminution of income on the other fide it may be alleged, that a very confiderable diminution was agreed to, at least of one third, in the alternative to pay in money, or tobacco, and that the imputation of avarice might be call by men, disposed to find fault, and who have the arromen, disposed to find fault, and who have the gance to expect, that their dictate ought to be a rule to govern the conduct of others, if a diminution of two thirds had been sgreed to, and their proposition of a still greater reduction rejected—that if the regulation of the clergy, and officers had been established on the terms proposed by the upper house, general fa-tisfaction would have been given, and therefore this branch deserves no reproach, who offered their con-fent to a measure, which, if adopted by the other, would have been thus satisfactory—that this regulation was rejected through the influence of men, whose aim it was to create confusion, and popular discontents, which they have many opportunities of fomenting by their declariations and harrangues, in which they affirm, with very little (cruple, what may subserve the purposes of pleasing their vanity, magnifying their importance, calibrating their care. importance, celebrating their own pure, and immacu-

late virtues, and gratifying their spleen against their political antagonists. A declaimer of this kind-

" Confidens, tumidus, a leo sermonis amari, " Sisennas, Barros ut equis precurreret albis."

hic, si plostra ducenta, "Concurrantque fore tria funera, magna fonabit
Cornua quod vincatque tubas."—— †

must speak with great energy, and persuasive force. Thus suppositions may be made, and imputations cast on either fide; but they concern not the question whether the regulation of fees always annexed to old, or conflitutional officers, not granting fees not before due,

but fixing their rates, be a tax, or not. Ovjection. The council advised the regulation of fees. Such of the provincial judges as were of the council, concurred in the advice. The legality of the regulation may be questioned before them, as judges; but this question was, " in some degree," prejudged by the advice they gave in council. The court appeals is constituted of the council, and the question may ultimately receive a decision in this court. The council in Nov. fession 1770 declined giving an opinion upon the question put by the lower house, "whether any officer had been guilty of ex-"tortion by the usual charges," upon this principle, that "it might come before them for decision in the

"court of appeals."

Answer. Upon the principle of this objection, the judges ought to establish no rule, 'till the legality of it is brought in question before them by the contest of parties, because the rule would, in some degree prejudge the question of its legality, which a party may choose to advance, therefore no rules or ordinances ought to be made by the courts, 'till a case between A. and B. is brought before them, and lawyers heard pro, and con, on the legality of them. This objection is, to be fure, very ingenious, though an obier. vance of the method suggested is liable to the dull exception, that it would promote litigation, and a confir erabie consequential expence. The judges, without paying a just regard to the principle, have settled the ates of iees; they have occasionally informed themselves, by impanelling a jury of efficers. The rates of fees nave been fettled in consequence of a royal commission issued on the address of the commons-the commons in 1752 thought the establishment of fees, the proper means of preventing excessive exactions. Various orders, and regulations of practice have been established by the courts, frequent have been the conferences of the judges for the purpote of fettling general rules, and an uniformity of c nduct. Judges have been called upon, in council, to advite their fovereign on questions of law. Judges, in inferior jurisdictions, have acted as judges, in the house of lords in the same cause. In all the cases put, the objection would apply with equal force; but, I suspect, he would be deemed to be rather an odd fert of a person, who should make it, in any of them-it would be a very difficult thing, fuch are the narrow prejudices of judges, to establish the liberal fentiment—expedit reipublica ut (non) it finis atium, (it would be of publick advantage to have no end to fuits,) and bring into contempt the adage, misera est servitus, ubi jus eit vagum, (wretched is the flavery where the law is unfettled.) The question put by the lower house, and which the upper declined answering, related to the construction of an act of asfembly, and trantactions under it, whether certain charges were criminal or not, and consequently whether penalties had been incurred, or not. The principle, on which the upper house acted, will best appear from their own words I. The regulation of fees was in profeet, the question was put to obtain an answer, with retrof-The one to prescribe a rule for the future conduct of officers, the other to draw a censure, of what

Objection. Two of those, who advised the governor, were interested, and if a suit be brought before twelve judges, and two of them plaintins, should those two fit in judgment on their own case, and deliver their opinions in favour of their own claims, the judgment would be void. Besides in the present cases the other advisers might be swayed by the prospect of a remote interest. The governor, as chancellor, might decree his own sees, under his own regulation or results. tion or refuse to affix the seals, without immediate

payment. Answer. This is putting one case, in the place of another of a very different nature. The advisers of the proclamation, restraining the officers, did not all in the capacity of judges; it flowed from the governor's authority over officers removeable by him, and as I have

" Consident, and boisterous, of such bitterness of speech that be would outstrip the Sijenna, and Barrs (most in-" famous for their virulence) if ever fo well prepared to " exert their talent,"

When two hundred waggons croud the fireet,

.. And three long funerals in procession meet,

"Beyond the fifes, and borns his voice he raises,
"And sure such strength of lungs a wonderous praise it;"

The questions, as you have proposed them, are of a very extraordinary nature, and of a tendency inconsistent with the spirit of our constitution. The resolves, or declarations of one, or both bouses, bowever affertive in opinion, and webement in expression, are not laws, nor ought they to be promulgated to influence the determination ought they to be promulgated to influence the determination of the legal appointed courts. Juries, and judges ought there to give their decisions without prejudice, or has. Whether any afficer has been guilty of extortion, is a question, which unither your, nor our declaration ought to prejudicate; but that our declarations held out to the publich would have, in no small decree, this effect, can of publich would have, in no small degree, this effel, can bardy be doubted, and on our part, particularly such a declaration would be the more improper, the last legal appeal in this province being to us: it awaild be to anticipate questions before they come to us through their regu-

already faid, his conduct was not to be directed by the votes of the majority of the advisers, they having no authoritative influence. I have already shewn that Lord Hardwicke had the advice, and anistance of the mafter of the rolls in fettling the tables of fees, in which the fees, due to the latter, were included-that. officers, and clerks of the courts have affifted the judges in their establishment of tables of fees. Their opinions were not binding, but their information was called for. The authority to regulate was reposed in the chancellor, and judges, and the establishments flowed from their authority. As to the supposition that the other adviters might be fwayed by their profpects; it is of such a kind, that it may be applied on all occafions-it may be applied to the moft violent demagogues, and experience would give it a colour. The ablurdity in supposing, that the governor is included in a proclamation threatening those officers with his displeasure, who should not obey his orders, has been fufficiently exposed. If he should have occasion to sue for fees due to him as chancellor, he could not, in the. court, where he is the fole judge. He receives his fees now, and would be equally entitled to receive them if the proclamation had not iffued. This part of the objection is not more extraordinary, on account of the extreme ignorance it betrays, than on this, that the fee for the feals was the fame in all the proposed regula-

Objection. Any person, the least acquainted with the arguments in savour of ship-money, and the dispensing power, will perceive tha Antion's defence of the regulation of sees is a repetition, and revival of them " tricked off in a new dress to hide their defor-" mity, the better to impose on the unthinking and

Answer. A person, the least acquainted with those arguments, may imagine they have been revived; but no one, well, or even a little acquainted with 'em, can. The affertion of the objectors is at random. They might as well have called the defence, a papal anathema, or bull in cæna Domini-fuch imputations, unsupported by proof, would almost diffrace the character of a spouting declaimer, too contemptible to be regarded.

Objection. That the argument from precedents doth not prove the right; it proves nothing more than a deviation from the principles of the condition, in those instances, wherein the power inth been illegary exercifed—that the inference from the prece est in New-York ought to be treated with great c. iten pt, perhaps, even with fome indignation, and a pain, thet is quoted to thew, that the argument from procedents is iuconfikent with the doctrine advanced by the author of it. The quotation is too long to repeat here, and therefore I refer the reader to the Citizen's aft

This pointless shaft hath been before thrown, without reaching the object, and " of I com-" prebend it right," there would be no amculty in alcertaining the quiver, whence it was supplied.

" The use of precedents mult be perceived, when " the inconveniencies of contention, which fi w from s a difregard of them are confidered, and especially when they are f-verely felt : when we reflect, that the intercourse of the members or political bodies, " the measures of justice in contents of private proper-"ty, the prerogatives of government, and the tights of the people are regulated by them " See the inef-

fage from the upper house, December tession 1765.

But I most readily admit that, " if what has been done, be wrong, it confers no right" to repeat the wrong, that " oppression, and outrage can't be justi" fied by instances of their commission," and that " if " a measure he incompatible with the constitutional rights er of the fulject, it is to far from being a rational a gu-"ment, that confiltency requires an adoption of the proposed measure, that, on the contrary, it suggests the strongest motive for abelifting the precedent, and " therefore when an inflance of deviation from the " constitution is pressed, as a resson for an establish-" ment firiking at the root of all liberty, it is inconclu-" five.

The precedents, I have cited, directly apply. have not attempted to draw any confequences from them, in support of a "measure incompatible with the conflitutional rights of the subject, or an esta-" blishment striking at the root of all liberty." The common law refults from general cultoms, precedents are the evidences of their cultoms, judicial determinations and decisions the most certain proofs of them, and the arguments therefore from precedents, the practice of courts, the decisions of judges respectable for their knowledge, and probity, and from the convenience of uniformity, are of great weight. I have proved that justice can't be administred, nor the laws duly executed without a fettlement of the rates of fees, that an authority to fettle them is necessary to the protection of the people, who, it officers were not refrained, would be exposed to the hazard of very great oppression. The conclusion, I contest, is not very great woundle to the liberal sentiments, and generous views of shofe, who are adverse to the narrow reftrictions of Internatical certainty, and, if allowed to choose their ground, would, like Archimedes, undertake to turn the world, which way they please.

" You knew me of old." You have the advantage, if your memory hath not been impaired, for I did not know you, and yet Cimex, you have my with,

Vestrum ob confilium, donent tonfore-

take back your shaft, and preserve it. There may be a future occasion, for its use.

Objection. If fees may be settled at one time, they may be increased at another, as happened in the year 1739, when the fees of theriffs were increased by pro-

_ may the powers divines For this same friendly assistance of thine,

" Give thee a barber in their fpetial grace."